

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/385,336

Applicant(s)
Roberts et al.

Examiner
Clark F. Dexter

Group Art Unit
3724

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Keith Haupt

(3) _____

(2) Mr. Clark Dexter

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 5, 2002

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 27 and 35

Identification of prior art discussed:
Keeny, pn 5,713,256; Burr, pn 5,222,624

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:


Mr. Haupt described how the present invention differs from the applied prior art. For example, applicant's position regarding the prior art rejection to claim 35 is that Burr does not teach and the prior art does not suggest a detector means for detecting a ticket that was dispensed from the dispensing means. Mr. Dexter's position is that the ticket is the work piece and therefore has not been given significant patentable weight. Mr. Dexter stated that favorable consideration would be given to claiming the tickets in combination with the terminal. Regarding claim 27, Mr. Dexter's position was similar regarding the work piece defined in the claim. Mr. Dexter stated that favorable consideration would be given to further defining the invention by reciting a controller to hold the tickets during separation. Further, Mr. Haupt stated that Keeny has two rotating separators and the present invention includes only one. Mr. Dexter agreed that defining that the invention has only one separator would obviate the claimed invention over the applied prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


CLARK F. DEXTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3724